RELATION AND DUTIES

OF

SERVANTS AND MASTERS;

BY J. L. WILSON.

If any man consent not to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, he is proud, knowing nothing. 1 Tim. vi. 3, 4.

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

CINCINNATI:
ISAAC HEFLEY & CO., PRINTERS.
1839.

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

PREFATORY REMARKS.

The following discourse was originally delivered, from short notes, in two lectures. They were not designed for publication, but for the instruction of a beloved people, in the regular course of my ministry, among them, to whom they are now respectfully inscribed. The doctrines taught have been so much misrepresented, that the cause of truth demands their publication.

Those who heard them, from the pulpit, will perceive, that the sentiments are not altered. The original method is also preserved, except that all the remarks come in *now* at the close. Some additional proofs and illustrations have been introduced to render particular parts more clear and convincing. I have but little hope of putting to silence "the ignorance of foolish man"; but, candid inquirers after truth may be profited, while I contribute my mite to the checking of American fanatacism, and American oppression.

J. L. W.

DUTIES OF SERVANTS AND MASTERS.

"Servants, be obedient to them that are your Masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ. Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord and not to men, knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And ye Masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with him."

EPHESIANS vi. 5–9.

There are so many conflicting opinions respecting the nature and obligations of the relation between Servants and Masters, that the discussion of the subject is considered, both delicate and difficult. From the attention given to this topic, it appears, that some men are influenced more by sympathy than reason; some are guided more by gain than humanity; while others, regardless of the rights and feelings of their fellow-citizens, adopt principles at variance with the word of God and pursue practices that trample under foot all existing institutions. May God enable me to escape these snares and so present this important subject, simply in the light of divine truth, that if any will take offence, it may be the word of God at which they stumble. For the sake of method, I shall attempt to show—

I. That the existence of a relation between Servants and Masters is as clearly admitted by the Inspired Writers as the existence of any other relation in human society.

II. Point out the modes mentioned in the Scriptures by which this relation has been formed.

III. Examine the different periods of servitude in different states of society.

IV. Specify the relative duties between Servants and Masters, and urge their performance by reasons and motives drawn from the Scriptures of truth.

V. Close, with some remarks which may naturally arise from the whole subject.

1. I shall attempt to show that the existence of a relation between Servants and Masters is as clearly admitted by the Inspired Writers as the existence of any other relation in human society.

Under this head I shall call your attention to the voice of Prophecy—to the moral law—to the language of devotion—to the instructions of Jesus and the injunctions of the Apostles.

1. Let us attend to the voice of prophecy.

After the destruction of the old world and the release of Noah and his family from the ark, we have a short, but mournful account of a transaction which has left a blot upon the character of the patriarch and stampt upon a portion of his posterity the seal of degradation. God had graciously entered into a covenant with Noah—accepted his devotions—given him most salutary instructions—and opened the way for him and his sons to engage in useful pursuits and populate the earth. Noah became a husbandman, planted a vineyard, and in process of time became intoxicated, by drinking wine. Ham, one of his sons, the father of Canaan, wickedly exposed his father's shame to his brethren, Shem and Japheth. They, with filial affection and respect, in the most delicate manner, protected their venerable parent from further mockery, and administered a merited rebuke to their depraved brother. But God, who saw the end from the beginning—who saw that this was only the prelude to a course of wickedness in the family of Ham—who claims the right of punishing sin in whatever way he *will*—who visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children down to generations of them that hate him—DETERMINED to punish the descendants of Ham, under his providential government, by making them servants to their brethren. Accordingly, he inspired Noah to pronounce the curse of servitude, not upon Ham personally, but upon his posterity. "And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his younger son had done unto him; and he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants

shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." Gen. ix. 24–27. Wherever this curse fell, and whenever this Prophecy was fulfilled, then and there, under the Providential Government of God, was the relation between Servants and Masters formed. If men can forfeit their lives by sin, they can also forfeit their liberties, and God may punish them by war, or famine, or pestilence, or fire from heaven, or *servitude*, as "seemeth good in his sight." This truth can only be denied by gross Infidelity.

2. Let us attend to the divine law.

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy—in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter; thy *man-servant* nor thy *maid-servant*, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger." And further—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his *man-servant*, nor his *maid-servant*, nor his ox." Exodus xx. 8–10, 17. If the relation between Servants and Masters is not admitted here as clearly as the relation between Father and Son, husband and wife, citizen and stranger, owner and ox, then I cannot understand the plain language of the moral law.

3. The language of devotion is no less distinct.

"Behold, as the eyes of *Servants* look unto the hand of their *Masters*, and as the eyes of *a Maiden* unto the hand of her *Mistress;* so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God until that he have mercy upon us." Psalms cxxiii. 2.

4. In connexion with this we may learn of Him, who was meek and lowly, and from *his* Apostles, who wrote by the inspiration of God.

When our Lord Jesus Christ taught his disciples a lesson of the most implicit obedience—the most absolute subjection to his authority—the most perfect compliance with his will; and pointed out their entire destitution of claim upon him for either reward or gratitude; he referred them to the known relation between *Servants* and *Masters*. "Which of you, having a *servant* ploughing, or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he has come from the field, 'Go, and sit down to meat?' And will not rather say unto him, 'Make ready where-

with I may sup, and gird thyself and serve me till I have eaten and drunken, and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?' Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, 'We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.'" Luke xvii. 7–10.

And the Apostle Peter, after speaking of the duty of Christians to submit to civil rulers, whether governors or kings, adds, "Servants, be subject to your Masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." 1 Pet. ii. 13–21. See also, the instructions of Paul in our text.—"Servants be obedient unto them that are your Masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart as unto Christ."

Now I ask, what relation in human society is more clearly admitted by the inspired writers than the relation between *Servants* and *Masters?* Tell me, which is the plainest form of speech—"Christians submit yourselves unto governors"—"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands"—"Children obey your parents"—or, "*Servants* be obedient to them that are your *Masters?*" There can be but one opinion here. Every person of common sense, and common honesty, will give the same answer. But you may say, "This is all true. You have taken pains to prove what no one denied! But we deny that the relation is lawful. Are not many things said to exist—are not connexions in life formed and recorded in history and sometimes taken as illustrations of truth and duty that are most unlovely and reprehensible?" In reply to this, it is readily granted that the inspired writers have recorded some things on which they at once fixed the seal of condemnation. They have written other things without saying whether they were right or wrong. It is granted that the relation formed between Jezebel and the Elders of Jezreel for the destruction of Naboth is marked with reprobation—but the relation formed between Joseph and Potiphar is not so marked. Whether this relation was lawful, according to the existing rules of society, under the Providential Government of God, is to be learned from other sources of information and not from the simple narrative of the historian.

What I have proved is that the relation between *Servants* and *Masters* is admitted. I shall now prove that the relation is recognized as lawful by the sacred writers.

1. To prove this, I shall notice the covenants God made with Abraham.

We are informed that "Abram had sheep and oxen and he-asses and *men-servants* and *maid-servants* and she-asses and camels." Gen. xii. 16. "And Abram was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold." xiii. 2. And his servant when sent to obtain a wife for Isaac, said, "The Lord hath blessed my Master greatly, and he hath become great, and He hath given him flocks and herds and silver and gold and *men-servants* and *maid-servants* and camels." Gen. xxiv. 35.

The language here used ascribes to the Lord the whole of Abram's wealth, and declares the *Servants* to be as much his property as the flocks and herds. Perhaps you will say "this was the language of a devout but ignorant servant." I ask in turn, how did the king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, treat Abram when he met him and saw him exercising authority over so many *Servants?*" Did he denounce him as a man-stealer and a tyrant, because, when he came up from Egypt he brought his *servants*, as well as his wife and money, with him? No, he blessed him, and said, "Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth." Gen. xiii. 1. and xiv. 14, 19. How did the Lord himself treat Abram? Did he say, "You are sustaining an unlawful relation—you are guilty of a heinous sin by keeping these *Servants*—you must immediately abolish your whole system without regard to consequences?" No—"The Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, fear not Abram, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." And he made with Abram two Covenants. In the first he gave him assurance of a numerous offspring and an extensive territory, "from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." Gen. xv.

In the second Covenant he said, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." Gen. xvii. In the former, he engaged *temporal*, in the latter, *spiritual* blessings—the one was ratified by "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp," symbols of the divine presence, passing between the pieces of slain

animals,—xv. 9, 10, 17,—the other was confirmed by the ordinance of Circumcision—the sign of regeneration and seal of the righteousness of faith. When God entered into covenant with Abram, did he intimate that the relation between him and his *servants* was unlawful? Did he order the connexion to be immediately dissolved? Far otherwise. God recognized them as belonging to Abraham, and commanded him to put on them the seal of his Covenant. "Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be the token of the Covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumscised among you, every man child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed." Genesis xvii. 11, 12. "In the self-same day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son; and all the men of his house, born in his house or bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him." v. 26, 27.

2. The lawfulness of the relation between *Servants* and *Masters*, is proven by the 4th and 10th commandments of the decalogue. The moral law is of universal obligation. It is confessedly the law of love. It is so expounded by our blessed Lord. Yet the lawfulness of this relation is recognized in both tables of this law. And as long as there shall be a Sabbath that ought not to be profaned by servile labor—as long as there shall be a human being who shall be prone to covet what belongs to another, the lawfulness of this relation will be acknowledged by all who admit that the law was given by Moses, and that the Lord Jesus Christ knew how to expound it.

3. If further proof of the lawfulness of the relation be required, we find it in the histories of two devout Centurions mentioned in the New Testament. These were officers in the Roman army. They were under the authority of Cæsar. The first expressed his faith in Christ by the declaration of an opinion that Jesus Christ could cure diseases, at a distance, as easily as he could command the obedience of his soldiers and *servants*. He said to Jesus, "Speak the word *only* and my *servant* shall be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man go and he goeth, and to another come and he cometh, and to *my servant*

do this and he doeth it." Did Christ marvel at his wickedness and tell him he had no right to have a servant? Quite the reverse. "When Jesus heard it he marveled, and said to them that followed him, verily I say unto you I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel. And I say unto you that many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven."—Mat. viii. 5–13.

The other Centurion was directed by an angel to send for Peter, who should "tell him what he ought to do." "And when the angel which spake unto Cornelius was departed, he called two of his *household servants* and a devout soldier of them that waited on him continually—and sent them to Joppa." Read over the history of this Centurion, this commander of the Italian band, and tell me, if you can find the slightest censure cast upon him for the relation he sustained to his *household servants?* Acts x. xi.

One more proof of the lawfulness of the relation may be added. "Let as many *servants as are under the yoke* count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. If any man teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmising, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; from such withdraw thyself." 1 Tim. vi. 1–5.

Paul left Timothy at Ephesus to maintain purity of doctrine. Ch. i. 3. In that church there were Christian servants. Some belonged to unbelieving and some to believing masters. Such as served unbelieving masters would be tempted to despise them because they held to a false religion. Such as had believing masters would be tempted to despise them because they were brethren, put upon a spiritual equality in the church. They might not, at first, perceive the difference

between equality in Christian privileges and equality in civil and social rights. Against such temptations the Apostle instructs Timothy how to guard these Christian servants. A pagan servant was bound to honor his own master but a Christian servant instead of doing less should do more; "Count his own master worthy of all honor," for the credit of the gospel—for the honor of God. Christian servants had no right to despise their unbelieving masters—much less were they allowed to despise believing masters. They were bound to serve unbelievers, much more under obligation to do service to believers. None then could say that the Christian religion taught servants to be disobedient to their masters, or to break the bonds of civil relations. On the contrary, Christianity made every thing the best of its kind. The best officers, the best soldiers—the best masters, the best servants. But some strangely tell us that "there were no believing masters."—They affirm that believers were called *Masters* after they ceased to be so, as Rahab was called the harlot after she became pious, and Saul was called the persecutor after he became a Christian. But how does such a criticism agree with Paul's plain directions? The injunction given was to "servants under the yoke," not to freed-men. "Under the yoke" denotes both subjection and labor. Christianity found them "under the yoke," and it did not cancel their obligations. Those who teach servants to despise their masters, to neglect their work, to disobey or abscond are such as Paul described. Had he looked down to the present state of society, his language could not have drawn a more correct and vivid picture. To prevent such evils in the primitive church Paul gave these instructions to Timothy, and in his Epistle to the church of Ephesus, he gave the instructions contained in our text—"Servants be obedient unto them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling:"—and Peter says, "not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." By tyrannical masters this relation might be abused; but this abuse did not release servants from obligation. Especially Christian servants must obey for the credit of religion, and more especially those who had believing masters, partakers of the same salvation from sin. "For in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor

Greek, male nor female, barbarian, Scythian, *bond* nor *free*, but Christ is all and in all." Col. iii. 11.

II. I come now to point out the modes mentioned in the Holy Scriptures by which this relation between Servants and Masters has been formed.

Here it is proper to notice that this is not a natural relation, as that between children and Parents. It is not always conventional, or by agreement, as that between husbands and wives. But it is commonly a forced relation, originating in a defective, sinful state of society, and must be classed among the sad effects of the fall of man from his original righteousness and happiness. It may be classed with war, which is always a sore evil, and is lawful or unlawful according to circumstances and according to the existing laws of civil society. We are first informed of the existence of servitude in the writings of Moses. He tells us not, when, or where, or by whom, the first servant was forced into bondage. But in giving a brief history of Abraham he informs us that the Patriarch had three kinds of servants:

Servants bought with his money from strangers.

Servants born in his house.

Servants presented to him by the King of Gerar.

"And Abimeleck took sheep and oxen and men-servants and maid-servants, and gave them unto Abraham, and said, behold my land is before thee, dwell where it pleaseth thee." Gen. xx. 14, 15. Abraham's servants were from different countries. One we know was from Egypt—and one from Damascus—some were from Gerar. And at one time he had three hundred and eighteen, able to bear arms, born and trained in his own house or family.

Joseph, the great-grandson of Abram, was sold into servitude by his brethren. The purchasers sold him into Egypt. Speaking of this transaction to Pharaoh's cupbearer, he said—"indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews." Gen. xl. 15. Now whatever might have been the crimes committed by others in producing the hardship of his case, he never questioned the right of Potiphar to command him, nor his obligations to be a faithful servant. Manstealing was a crime; servitude was a forced state, and Joseph's case a great

hardship. But a relation was formed between him and his master, the duties of which he discharged with fidelity, and the Lord prospered him.

The bondage of the Israelites, after the death of Joseph, was a cruel bondage. Of this God had long before informed Abram and promised to avenge their wrongs. Gen. xv. 13, 14. Hard as their servitude was, according to existing laws, they had no right to refuse obedience to their taskmasters. And when Moses rashly interfered and slew one of the oppressors, he had to escape to the land of Midian to save his own life. The time had not come for the deliverance God had promised; and Moses began in the wrong way and at the wrong place to work the deliverance of his people.

Under the Jewish Theocracy we find several kinds of servants. Poor people sometimes sold themselves. Gen. xxv. 47. Insolvent debtors might be sold by the magistrate.—v. 39. Servants might be purchased from the heathen or from the children of strangers who sojourned in the land. Lev. xxv. 44–46. For the crime of fraud persons were made servants from generation to generation. The case of the Gibeonites is in point. They, with others, for their wickedness, had been condemned by the Lord to utter destruction. To save their lives they cheated Joshua and the Elders of Israel into a treaty of peace. When the fraud was discovered, the treaty was kept, but they were condemned to perpetual servitude. For this condemnation there were no tokens of divine displeasure upon the Israelites. But when Saul, the first King in Israel, broke this treaty and murdered a number of the Gibeonites, the Lord visited the land with famine, and public justice demanded the capital punishment of Saul's sons before the calamity was removed. Joshua said to the Gibeonites, when he doomed them to servitude—"Wherefore have ye beguiled us?"—"Ye are cursed, and there shall none of you be freed from being bondmen." They replied—"We are in thine hand; as it seemeth good and right unto thee to do unto us, *do*." Servitude then was a cursed thing, yet it was lawful for some to be servants and others to be masters. So it is written. "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Yet it was lawful to hang some men on a tree. Compare Josh. ix. with 2d Samuel xxi.

In the New Testament we meet with some passages which afford us important information. Though the sacred writers have not informed us how or for what causes men were brought into bondage under the Roman government, yet the existence of servitude is every where admitted. The original language of the New Testament is very copious, and has various words to denote different kinds of servants.* The word translated

---

* The following examples will illustrate this remark:
Ho pais mou—my servant. Matt. viii. 6.—my boy.
To doulo mou—to my servant. V. 9.—to my slave.
Misthioi—hired servants. Luke xv. 17.—mercenaries.
Hoi diaconoi—the servants. John ii. 9.—deacons or waiters.
Ton oiketon—household servants. Acts x. 7.—domestics.
Somaton—slaves. Rev. xviii. 13.—bodies or persons.
Hupo zugon douloi—servants under the yoke. 1 Tim. v. 1.
Sub jugo servi—slaves in abject bondage. "*Tribus hastis jugum fit, humi fixis duabus, superque ea transversa una deligata.*"—Liv. The yoke was constructed with three spears, two fixed (as uprights) in the ground, and one tied transeversely upon them—(in the form of a gallows)—like a beam laid over two posts, on which malefactors were hung. Under this, prisoners of war, condemned to slavery, were compelled to pass in token of perpetual bondage. *Servus*, the Latin translation of *doulos*, means a slave.
"*Quid tu? Servus ne es an liber?*"—Plaut.
What are you? a slave or a freeman?
The Greek, *kerdon*, signifies a low slave, a menial; but the word *doulos* is the general term for *slave* in the New Testament, translated *servant*. Doulos, an adjective, servile, subservient. Doule, a female slave; doulia, slavery; doulias, slavish; douleuo, to be a slave; douloprepes, befitting a slave; douloo, to reduce to slavery; doulomai, to become a slave; doulosume, bondage; douloteros, more a slave.
Phil. ii. 7. "Made himself of no reputation and took upon him *the form of a servant.*" Morphen doulou—*the form of a slave* is put in contrast with *morphe theou*, the form of God—v. 6—the highest and lowest. The "*form of God*" was exhibited in the stupendous miracles wrought by Jesus Christ—"*the form of a slave*" in his death on the cross—the death, not of a citizen but a slave.
Luke ii. 29. "Lord, lettest now thy servant depart in peace."—Despota ton doulon sou—here *despot* and *slave* are contrasted—the highest power and lowest dependence—the state of being at the absolute disposal of another. Simeon was under the absolute dominion of his Lord.

servants in our text signifies slaves. I have not used the term slave because it is offensive, and because the original word is nowhere so translated in the New Testament. The Greek word is rendered *servus*, by the Latins, from which is derived the French term *servant*, and this is adopted by our translators.

We find the word slaves in Rev. xviii. 13, where a part of the merchandize of the Mother of Harlots is said to be "horses and chariots and *slaves* and souls of men." The word rendered *slaves* signifies *bodies*, and is so translated in our best marginal Bibles. "*Bodies* and *souls* of men"! These have been a conspicuous part of the merchandize of Papal Rome, in various ways, but most notoriously in the AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE. Every one acquainted with the history of that nefarious traffic, knows that the subjects of Papal Rome were the first to begin and the last to abandon this accursed trade.*

In 1 Timothy vi. 1. Douloi—*slaves*, is in contrast with dospotas—*despots*. They who affirm that *despotas* cannot be applied to Christian masters may be startled, perhaps, to hear old Simeon apply the same term to God. Paul was the *doulos* of Jesus Christ, absolutely bound to do and suffer according to his master's will.

Romans i. 1. "Paulos *doulos* Iesou Christou."

The Greeks had also a variety of words to denote different kinds of masters.

Rabbi—master. Heb. Rabboni—master. Chal. a term of respect—sir.

Kathegetes—master—a guide, conductor.

Diduskalos—master—professional teacher.

Epistates—master—governor, superintendent.

Kurios—master—supreme ruler, Lord.

Despotes—master—owner, proprietor, supreme ruler,

In Ephesians vi. 5–9—Col. iii. 22, and iv. 1, *Kurios* is contrasted with *Doulos*. In 1 Tim. vi. 1, and Titus ii. 9, *Despotes* is the anthithesis of *doulos*. In 1 Peter ii. 18, the opposition is between *despotes* and *oiketes*, a household servant, though under as absolute dominion as a servant that worked in the field or fed cattle.

I have been thus particular to show that "they are proud, knowing nothing," who affirm that *doulos* never means a *slave*, and that *despotes* is never applied to a believing master.

* THE LAST TO ABANDON. Great Britain and the United States legislatively abolished the foreign slave trade thirty years ago. Spain, Portugal, and some other Roman Catholic Powers, slowly and reluctantly came into the measure by treaties—and last of all, the Brazilian Empire.

When Paul used the phrase "Servants under the yoke," I understand him to allude to the Roman contrivance with forks and spears, under which vanquished enemies doomed to bondage were forced to pass. In the time of Paul it was as in the time of Abraham. Some were forced into servitude; others were born servants. When a tumult was made at Jerusalem, and the chief-captain commanded that Paul should be examined by scourging: as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the Centurion that stood by, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned?" When the chief-captain was informed that Paul was a Roman Citizen, he said, "with a great sum obtained I this freedom." But Paul said "I was free born." Acts xxii. 24–28, and xxi. 39.

The chief-captain had been born a servant—Saul his prisoner had been born free! Lysias had purchased his freedom with a great sum. Paul, for the love of the truth, was in bonds! Such are the changes in human affairs; yet the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!

III. I come now to point out the periods of extension and limitation of servitude* in different states of society.

The servitude in Abraham's family was not transmitted to posterity. It is said "Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac. But unto the sons of the concubines that Abraham

---

Revelation xviii. 13. Soomatoon kai psukas anthroopoon—bodies and souls of men—i. e. the persons of men—translated slaves.

When the Prophet Ezekiel predicted the great and irrevocable fall of Tyrus, he depicted also her crimes, among which he enumerates the ancient slavetrade carried on by her merchants.

"Javan, Tubal and Mesheck were thy merchants; they traded *the persons of men* and vessels of brass in thy market." Ezek. xxvii. 13.

Tyrus, the prototype, has fallen! has fallen! ages gone by!—When will her antitype—the great Babylon—be thrown down and be found no more at all? Rev. xvii. 5, and xviii. 13–21.

*In the book of Job, which is of very high antiquity, we are taught that servitude was for life. Speaking of the place of the dead, Job said "there the weary be at rest—there the prisoners hear not the voice of the oppressor, and the servant is free from his master." Job iii. 17–19.

had, Abraham gave gifts and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived." Gen. xxv. 5, 6.

We are not informed what became of Abraham's servants, but there is not the slightest evidence that any body ever had authority over them but himself and Isaac. Would Isaac transfer them to Esau, who sold his birthright? Certainly not.—Nor did he give them to Jacob. When Jacob went down into Egypt, "with all that he had," even the servants he brought from Padan Aram did not go with him. All the souls that went down were seventy—all of whom were his own children and grandchildren. Gen. xlvi. 27. Exod. i. 5.

The servitude of the Gibeonites was from generation to generation. It did not cease at the Babylonish captivity. They were then called Nethenims, and many returned with Zerubbabel and Ezra, being servants to the Israelites, in the *servile labor* of the Sanctuary.* They dwelt at Ophel and other places, and were under two directors, Ziha and Gispa. Brown's Bib. Dic. word GIBEON. As to Hebrew servants, they went out free at the end of six years, unless they preferred their condition of servitude to separation from their wives and children. If a Hebrew servant brought a wife with him, she should go out with him. If his master had given him a wife, he might stay in servitude with her, or leave her, as he pleased. Exodus xxi. 2–6. Deut. xv. 17. See Dr. Scott's notes.

The Israelites were permitted to buy servants of other nations. Levit. xxv. 44–46. This was a benevolent arrangement, that the Gentiles might become acquainted with the true religion. The token of God's Covenant was put upon them. Gen. xvii. 12–14—and thus, being admitted to religious privileges, they were soon prepared for the enjoyment of civil rights. Accordingly, provision was made for universal emancipation every fiftieth year. "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year,

---

* The word Nethenims signifies *given, offered,* or *devoted.* The Gibeonites were not the only persons who performed the servile labor of the Tabernacle and Temple. Some voluntarily engaged themselves or children, by "a singular vow." See Dr. Scott's note on Leviticus xxvii. 1–8.

and proclaim liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." Levit. xxv. 10.

Some contend that because the law of *emancipation* is found in the 10th verse, and the law of *bondage* in verses 44–46, that the Jubilee did not reach those who had been bought of the heathen, or of strangers who sojourned in the land! What! not reach them, when they were circumcised and inhabited the land as much as any Hebrew servant, male or female, whose ear had been bored with an awl! They might as well tell us that the Babylonish captivity will take place after the latter day glory, because it is written subsequently in the Book of Micah, ch. iv., comp. 1–3 with 9–10. They might as well affirm that repentance goes before faith because it is written in this order. Heb. vi. 1. Verily, he must be a blind guide who decides the import of a law merely from the place where it stands in the statute book; or determines the order of a doctrine in the evangelical system by its location in the Bible, or by the collocation of the words.

The year of Jubilee, commencing on the great day of atonement, typified "the acceptable year of the Lord," or the gospel dispensation—"GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY TO ALL PEOPLE." But if the sweet sound of the *Jubilee trumpet* meant no deliverance to the servants bought from the heathen, then it very poorly represented "the good things to come"—now proclaimed, by the *gospel trumpet, to the chief of sinners!* Tell me, for whose special benefit was the year of Jubilee appointed? Was it for the Hebrew who sold himself—or was sold by the Magistrate? Was he not free at the end of six years, without any Jubilee? Was it not for the benefit of families whose lands had been sold? For the benefit of him or her who had been born servants, for whose release the law had made no other provision?—For the benefit of him and her whose ears had been bored? For then they could not only go free, but take their families with them.—For the benefit of *all servants*, not otherwise provided for? Unless you can shew that they did not inhabit the land! The language of the statute is *explicit* and FULL. "And ye shall *hallow* the *fiftieth year* and proclaim LIBERTY throughout *all the land*, unto ALL THE INHABITANTS thereof." To servants, not to free inhabi-

tants.—"A jubilee, a sweet sound of trumpets, shall that fiftieth year be unto you."

The writer of the Epistle to the Gallatians, casts some light on this subject. "Now, I say, the heir so long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father."—Gal. iv. 1, 2.

At the time this was written, the Christian churches were generally composed of converts from among the Jews and Gentiles. But whether the Apostles wrote to Jewish or Gentile converts, they took their proofs and illustrations principally from the Old Testament dispensation.

During the patriarchal age, and downward, there was no laws regulating the minority of Children. They served their parents until the time appointed of the father. Isaac was not less than thirty years of age when Abram bound him and laid him on the altar. He was forty years old when he was married, and yet Abraham and his servant seem to have decided and conducted every thing about this interesting affair. Jesus of Nazareth was subject to Joseph and Mary till he was thirty years old. God wisely left parents to decide when their children should be free, and only gave laws respecting their relative duties.

But he legislated differently for servants, and among the Jews appointed the times of their freedom. Many were free every sixth year, and many more in the year of Jubilee, while many born in servitude, no doubt died in servitude during the intervening years.

In the Roman Empire, the civil, judicial, and domestic powers were pagan, and there was no such periodical emancipation. Some servants might be made free, others could not, in which case, Paul exhorted servants to resignation and obedience.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it, but if thou *mayest be made free*, use it rather. For he that is called of the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's free-man."—1 Cor. vii. 20—22.

The Epistle of Paul addressed to Philemon, affords additional light on this subject. This Epistle is one of the most

admired remains of Christian antiquity. It contains a kind request, an admirable argument, an exciting intercession, in favor of a dishonest, runaway servant. His master was a Christian of distinction, at Colosse, in Phrigia. The servant had wronged his master, and fled to Rome, where, by the grace of God, he became a Christian, under the ministry of Paul. The Apostle, on trial, finding Philemon's servant, Onesimus, a trustworthy disciple; and needing his aid at Rome, would have retained him as an assistant brother, had he been a freeman. But Onesimus belonged to Philemon, an eminent Christian, in a remote province; and Paul sent him back to his master, with this admirable letter, not of command, but of entreaty. What did the Apostle desire of Philemon? That he would forgive Onesimus, and not punish him for the wrong he had done—that he would receive him again, not as a servant, but above a servant—as a brother beloved—as Paul himself. Paul certainly desired Onesimus to be made free, according to his own doctrine—"If thou mayest be made free, use it rather."

But did Paul deny Philemon's right to hold Onesimus as a servant? Did he say that the master had no authority to punish him for his faults? Did he denounce Philemon as unfit for Christian communion, unworthy to associate with Archippus, the pastor of the church, or incapable of having a church in his own house, because he had a servant, whom he might retain in his service or liberate, as he pleased? None of all this. Paul calls Philemon his fellow-laborer, his brother, his partner. He pleads that he had been the instrument of his conversion. He endeavored to enlist in favor of Onesimus, Aphia, Archippus, and the Church in Philemon's house. Why all this mediation and true Christian eloquence, the real art of persuasion? Truly, Paul knew that Onesimus was Philemon's servant—that there must be strong prejudices in the mind of the master against one who had left his service in an infamous manner—that there might be temptations to covetousness, even in this good man, which would influence him to retain his servant, and it might seem difficult for Philemon to grant his request.

Look at the subject, in this light, and you have one of the most edifying specimens of Christian kindness, any where to

be found. Paul seemed confident of success. And had he been unsuccessful, in pleading for this christisn servant, we should hardly afterwards have seen the name of Onesimus united with Tychicus, as a messenger to the Church of Colasse, where Philemon was a member, and as some think, the colleague pastor with Archippus.

If it had been, as some pretend, that there were no "believing masters," this letter could never have been written. If it had been, as some affirm, that the relation between Servants and Masters is unlawful, and that where it exists, it ought immediately to be abolished without regard to consequences, then this Epistle is studiously elaborate about nothing! To what a degree of delusion must men be brought before they can adopt principles and form plans by which they impeach, not merely the good sense of Paul, but the wisdom of the Holy Ghost. I come now,

IV. To specify the relative duties between Servants and Masters, and urge their performance by reasons and motives drawn from the Scriptures of truth.

The Apostle in our text, addressed Christian Servants and Christian Masters. He calls them saints—faithful in Christ Jesus, who were blessed with spiritual blessings in Christ. The church of Ephesus was remarkably pure. No censure is cast upon it through the whole of this Epistle. And many years after, when the Lord Jesus wrote to them, by John, from Patmos, they were highly commended and only blamed for one symptom of declension—"thou hast left thy first love." This was the church of which Timothy was pastor when Paul wrote to him, saying, "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that *have* believing masters, let them not despise them, *because they are brethren;* but rather do them service, *because they are faithful*," i. e. believing.

Paul had predicted the rise of false teachers among the Christians at Ephesus. Acts xx. 28–30. He left Timothy there to prevent their baleful influence. 1 Tim. i. 3. Some, under pretence of great love to servants, would interfere in the civil affairs of the empire contrary to the wholesome words

of the Lord Jesus, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." They would lay down a false maxim that "gain is godliness"—manifesting their arrogance and ignorance—stirring up "strife, railing, and perverse disputings." If Paul had been drawing the picture of our own times, he could not have selected more appropriate language.* The church of Ephesus stood firm and faithful, and was long after commended by her Lord for her works and labor and patience; and for not bearing them that were evil; and for trying them that said they were Apostles, and were not, and finding them liars. Rev. ii. 1, 2. The address in our text is first to servants. The duties of inferiors being more contrary to corrupt nature, are harder to perform, than the duties of superiors. This makes it more needful to dwell longer on the duties of servants, and to require their performance even when superiors neglect their duties and abuse the authority with which they are invested. "Servants be obedient unto them that are your masters according to the flesh." And Peter adds—"not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." The duty of servants is summed up in one word—*obedience.* Here we must attend to the same limitation as in the case of wives and children.—"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands—*as unto the Lord.*" Ch. v. 22. "Children obey your parents—*in the Lord.*" Ch. vi. 1. "Servants, be obedient to your masters—*as unto Christ.*" Ch. vi. 5. *Obedience* in all things lawful and *nothing more.* Keep a good conscience towards God, whatever suffering you may endure. "For this is thankworthy if a man for conscience towards God, endure grief, suffering wrongfully—if when ye *do well* and *suffer* for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." 1 Peter ii. 19. 20.

Masters might treat servants ill by commanding unlawful things, and punishing them if they disobeyed. In such case,

---

* Paul did not advise that false teachers should be mobbed, whipt, imprisoned, or hung. He said, "from such withdraw thyself." He also reversed their pernicious proposition and said "Godliness, with contentment, is great gain." Happiness is not in liberty or bondage among men, but in the liberty wherewith Christ maketh his people free. "To die is gain," to the Lord's freemen.

Christ is set for an example to suffering servants—"Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered he threatened not, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." Eph. vi. 21–23.

Civil servitude is not inconsistent with Christian liberty. Christian servants are the Lord's freemen. "Masters according to the flesh" command and control their bodies; but God alone is Lord of their consciences. "Servants be obedient, *as unto Christ*—with good will doing service, *as to the Lord*." Let us notice some particulars, in connexion with these general injunctions.

1. The manner of obedience—"with fear and trembling"—*fear* to displease your masters—but fear *more* to displease Christ—*tremble*, when you justly incur your master's anger—but tremble *more* to offend Jesus, your Lord.

2. The disposition of heart, in obedience—"in singleness of your heart—with good will—not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ." Servants must not profess one thing and mean another—must not pretend to obey and design to disobey—must not make a show of work in their master's presence and be idle in his absence. No, they must fix their eye upon Christ, remember that he always sees them, and his authority obliges them to be cheerful and faithful in the duties of their stations.

3. The motives to obedience. I have mentioned *one*, they serve in the presence of Christ. When servants do their duty Christ puts an honour on their obedience. Service done to their earthly masters becomes acceptable to him, and they shall receive from him their wages in heaven. "Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free." Masters on earth may neglect, despise, or abuse their servants—may refuse them reward, or gratitude, for their cheerful, patient, faithful obedience—but the reward of the same shall they receive of the Lord, in heaven.

The poor, oppressed servant may say, "My master has time and opportunities to serve God and obtain heaven, but what can I do, in my ignorance and subjection?" Let me tell thee, thou canst attend to the duties of thy station, thou canst "with

good will do service to the Lord and not to men," and God will as certainly reward thee for the meanest drudgery done to his glory, as he will reward thy prince, thy magistrate, or thy master, for services performed *aright* in their respective stations. This leads us to consider the duty of Masters to Servants. Let us pay attention here!

"And ye masters do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening." And again, "Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in heaven." Col. iv. 1.

Masters are under as strict obligations to discharge their duty to their servants as servants are to be obedient unto them. But from general rules let us descend to particulars.

1. *Ye masters do the same things unto them*—that is, shew a like good will and concern for their welfare, and from the same motives, to approve yourselves to God, your master in heaven.

2. Forbearing threatening—moderating, or remitting evils threatened. "It is human to err—it is godlike to forgive." If a servant offend—"be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Remember, you are an offender too, and if God should mark iniquity, who could stand?

3. Do your servants justice. Supply them with proper food, raiment, lodging, medical skill and good nursing, as they may need. Give them no unlawful, unreasonable, oppressive commands—be faithful to all your promises.

4. Be not merely just but equitable. Your servants may have no legal claim, and yet their title to privilege may be equitable. You are bound to act the part of a wise and impartial chancellor, and when the rules of law do not compel you to grant their requests for indulgence, you must consider the equity of their plea, and do to them as you might reasonably expect them to do to you if your circumstances were changed. Attend more to their spiritual than their temporal interests. Give them opportunities of acquiring religious knowledge. Afford them time, place, and means of serving the Lord. If they are believing servants they are Christ's freemen! If you know them to be fit for civil liberty, and the laws of the land allow it, emancipate them that they may enjoy the benefits of Paul's advice. "If thou mayest be made free use it rather."

5. The motives from which masters are to act in the discharge of their duties to their servants. "Ye also have a Master in heaven." "There is no respect of persons with God." God will not regard the master because he is "clothed in purple"! God will not despise the servant because he appears in "vile raiment"! "God will render to every man according to his deeds." "Indignation and wrath upon every soul of man that doeth evil—glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good, whether he be bond or free." Comp. Col. iii. 11, and Rom. ii. 6–11.

V. I shall now conclude with some remarks, in view of this discussion.

1. Christianity can sanction no system of servitude which breaks up the domestic constitution, or in its operations desecrates the Sabbath. The moral law in which the relation between Servants and Masters is clearly recognized holds the Sabbath and marriage as sacred now as God at first appointed them. That law, as expounded by our Lord, is the law of Christian love, which worketh no evil. It is worse than idle for men to search into the judicial or ceremonial laws of the Jews to justify or palliate any system of servitude which disannuls the ties of domestic life, and treads with unhallowed step upon holy time. Though, under that dispensation, there were some things allowed, "because of the hardness of their hearts," which were not in strict accordance with the perfection of the moral law. Such allowances form no rule of duty or privilege to Christians. Besides, in the servitude under Abraham, in the servitude of the Gibeonites, in the servitude of the heathen purchased by the people of God, circumcised according to the law and emancipated on the great day of atonement, there is no proof of any disregard to the bonds of wedlock nor of the profanation of the Sabbath.

2. American Servitude is an anomaly.* It is a deviation

---

* This remark is intended to apply to all servitude of a similar kind, whether in the West Indies, or elsewhere. The servitude to which the Africans and their descendants are subjected among nations, nominally Christian, is without a prototype. I do not mean to say that it is more horrible in all its features than servitude has been among Pagans

from all common examples. In vain do we look for any thing like it in Egyptian bondage. The great body of the people dwelt in Goshen. The taskmasters oppressed those who were compelled to labor on the public works—some of the male children were cruelly destroyed—but the people knew their tribes—had their Elders—and when the time of deliverance came, those, who were occupied, in other parts of Egypt, could repair to their own family, tribe, and eldership, and move to the place of general meeting. The parts of the land of Egypt inhabited by the Israelites were exempted from the plagues brought upon Pharaoh and his servants, or else human subsistence would have been rendered impossible without a miracle. American Servitude has no analogy in the case of the Gibeonites. They dwelt by themselves. They were "hewers of wood and drawers of water to the whole congregation" in the service of the Tabernacle. They served the Priests and Levites in the drudgery of the altar. They were never sold among the people to labor as cultivators, feeders of cattle, or domestics. And they who look into the family of Abraham, or into the Babylonish captivity, to find a likeness for American Servitude, show a degree of blindness little short of judicial.

When we come down to New Testament times, do we find any thing like American Servitude among the Romans and their colonies? In the Roman Empire we find Jewish servitude, where "the heir, so long as he was a child, differed nothing from a servant, though he were Lord of all, but was under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father." We find Greek and Roman Servitude where masters might scourge, brand, or crucify their servants without being accountable to any human tribunal. Mostly the servants provided for themselves and also labored for their masters. They had their own families, lived on their own *peculia* or *private possessions*, which were distinct from the *stocks* of their masters. Some had been made to pass under the yoke and doomed to perpetual bondage. Others might be liberated by benevolent

---

and Mahommedans; but it has some revolting features, *sui generis*, peculiar to itself. There is no original, of which it is any thing like an exact copy.

masters, or they might purchase their own freedom, from their own estates. When servants were made free, the high way to wealth, to literary distinction, to civil office, to military glory, lay open before them. Claudius Lysias, who had purchased his freedom with a great sum, commanded Roman Centurions and soldiers at Jerusalem. P. Terentius and other freed-men, arose to literary and political distinctions, obtaining the patronage and enjoying the society of men of the highest ranks in life. But how different the condition and prospects of American Servants—especially of those who are liberated from bondage.*

---

* It was not intended in this lecture to give an account of Greek or Roman servitude in all the details and varieties of the shocking evil—but only to show by a brief sketch that American servitude is not like any thing that preceded it, being in some respects better and in some worse, than the bondage under pagan despotisms.

The following statements, published by the WESTERN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, appear to me most extravagant, on the subject of patriarchal servitude.

"Slavery seems to have existed before the flood. Noah speaks of it as a thing well known. Among the ancient patriarchs it was very common. The *servants*, of whom we hear in the history of their times, were properly *slaves*, who might be bought and sold without any regard to their own will. Some of the richer shepherds, like Abraham and Job, appear to have had thousands of them belonging to their household." Bib. Antiq. vol. 1, p. 143.

The following notice may give some idea of the difference between the condition and prospects of freed-men in the Roman Empire and emancipated slaves in the United States.

NEW ORLEANS, MARCH 13th, 1839.

FREE NEGROES.

The legislature of Alabama have passed an act prescribing that every free person of color arriving in that state, on board a vessel as cook, steward, mariner, or in any other employment, shall be immediately lodged in prison, and detained until the departure of the said vessel, when the captain thereof shall be bound under a heavy penalty, to take him away. If any free person of color thus sent away, shall return, he or she shall receive thirty-nine lashes, and if found within the state twenty days after such punishment, he or she shall be sold as a slave for any term not exceeding one year. The captain of any vessel in which such free person of color shall arrive, shall give security in the sum of two thousand dollars, that he will take away the said free person of color. The 6th section makes it lawful for any person to seize and make a slave for life, to his own use, any free person of color, who may have come into

The Prophet Daniel, after describing the golden, silver, brass, and iron kingdoms, commencing with the Babylonish monarchy, and descending to the Roman Empire, said, "In the days of these kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed." Dan. ii. 44. This was the kingdom of Christ, set up in the world, but it was not of this world. It was a spiritual kingdom. It was not *meat* nor *drink*, but righteousness, peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost. It was set up and spread for the benefit of the Jew, and Greek, and Roman—for the barbarian, Scythian, bond and free—for the male and female—for the parent and child—for the master and servant. "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." Jesus Christ was born and lived and died under the Roman government. Joseph and Mary were taxed under a decree of Augustus Cæsar. Our Lord himself paid tribute to Tiberius. He commended the devout Centurion who commanded soldiers, and owned servants. He spake "wholesome words"—"Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's." He sent his disciples to "preach the gospel to every creature." It was no part of their commission to inquire for what purposes taxes were gathered—why the armies were levied—nor how some became servants, and others masters. They found "the world lying in wickedness," and it was their delightful work, by spiritual and heavenly remedies, "to open their blind eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." In doing this, they addressed all classes of men.

They said to citizens, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers,"—to magistrates, "Be not ye a terror to good works, but to the evil"—to servants, "Count your own masters worthy of all honor"—to masters, "Render unto your

---

the state of Alabama, after the 1st day of February, 1832, provided this section shall not take effect until the 1st day of August next. The 7th section makes it lawful for any person to seize upon and make a slave for life, any free person of color who may be found in the state of Alabama after the passage of this act, and who shall have come into the state since its passage. Approved Feb. 2, 1839.—[Louisianian.

servants that which is just and equal." They said to all men "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king." Rom. xiii. 1, 8. 1 Pet. ii. 11, 23.

Nero was on the throne of the Cæsars when Paul and Peter wrote to the churches and to the strangers scattered abroad. But did they hesitate to call sins by their right names? They said, with due emphasis, that man-stealing, murder, idolatry, drunkenness, oppression, and fraud were sins, and yet they never said it was a sin to own a servant and to exact from him obedience to lawful commands!

Some of those who first began the anomaly of American servitude, might have been actuated by good motives.

They took the captive African from paganism and violence, and placed him among a professedly Christian people. But the manner in which the traffic has been carried on, and the system of servitude established for more than 300 years, is, for injustice and cruelty, without a parallel in the world's history. But remember, it was not Pagan Rome, but Christian Europe, that brought this evil upon America. The American colonies, blighted by the mother country, under the providence of God, rose to independence, among the nations of the earth. But in settling the basis of their own government, the servitude of the Africans was continued. It was continued by national agreement. It belongs not to a section or fragment of the people. The nation continued it, and the nation can end it, whenever the political will of the people is so expressed in a constitutional way. *Till then*, "the powers that be" must be obeyed by the due submission of servants and masters.

3. When the Presbyterian Church was organized and commenced her Christian operations in North America, she found servitude planted deep in the political, civil, and domestic institutions of the country. Like Christ and his apostles, in the Roman Empire, Presbyterians took matters as they found them,—interfered not, with the civil relations existing in the commuity, but attempted to prescribe scriptural remedies for what they saw to be a great evil. They could not deny the lawfulness of the relation between Servants and Masters no more than they could deny the lawfulness of war, when the

"powers that be" said there should be war.* But the Presbyterian Church has borne, and still bears, a testimony against the *abuses* of this relation† as they exist in the system of American Servitude. I should gladly read this testimony, did time permit. It is published in our Digest, and may be read and known

---

* It seems the discovery has been made that "*war is sin!*" Yes, for whatever cause and for whatever wrong done, still, "*war is sin!*" "It is a sin to take human life in any case—capital punishment," even "for murder is sin!" And the scenes of the battle;—garments rolled in blood—the scaffold and guillotine are painted with all the arts of imagination to sustain this dogmatism.

Where did the reformers make these discoveries? Was it in Palestine, where Abraham smote the allied kings and brought again his brother Lot and the women that had been taken captive? Was it on the hill, where Aaron and Hur held up the hands of Moses and the Lord sware "*war* with Amalek from generation to generation?" Was it when the sun and moon stood still, till the warriors had finished the slaughter? Or did they learn it from John, who said to the soldiers, "do violence to no man and be content with your wages?" Or from Paul, who commanded Christians to "be subject to the higher powers?" Or from Christ, who commended the Centurion's faith? No, verily. They learned their maxims in the school of infidelity—in the folly of human wisdom; and they wield their weapons of "radical and sweeping reform" against all institutions, civil and divine. Their language is like *this*—"Who made the man head of the woman in marriage? What right have Parents to command or Rulers to tax *me*, without my consent? Who gave the past generation a right to divide the earth before we came into the world?"

Alas! The Republicans of France laid aside the Bible, and the Jacobins of America do the same! France was drenched in blood under the watchford *Reform;* and America ought to profit by the example!

† *Abuses of this relation.* "A father, among the Romans, had the power of life and death over his own children; he might expose them when infants—imprison, scourge, or put them to death, when grown up. A son could acquire no property but by his father's consent, and what he acquired was called his *peculium*, as of a servant." Roman Antiq. Dillaway, page 22.

This piece of history may benefit some who have been incapable of making a distinction between a lawful relation and the abuses of such a relation. Was the relation between father and son "*a damning sin*," because it was abused at Rome?

by all men.* The church then, which is the kingdom of Christ set up amongst men, bears her testimony against oppression, against Sabbath-breaking, against transgressions of the seventh commandment; with as much freedom and force as she does against intemperance, theft, disobedience to parents, or any other thing forbidden by the word of God. But the true Church of Christ will not, nay, she dare not, under the laws and example of her Head, interfere with the civil institutions of these United States. Her members, whether bond or free, must submit to "the higher powers." All the Church has a right to exact of her members is the faithful discharge of relative duties.

4. My last remark is on the subject of run-a-way servants. A doctrine has been preached and published among us, that such servants should be concealed, and conveyed away from their masters. It is said that this doctrine and practice is warranted by the divine law. The statute cited to support it is in Deut. xxiii. 15, 16. "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." To say that this passage authorised Christians, living in the Roman provinces, or warrants those residing in these United States, to conceal or convey away fugitive servants, is an entire perversion of the word of God. For 1. It is evident that the law is addressed to the magistrates and not to the common people. The character of the fugitive, the causes of his flight, the granting of the rights of citizenship, implied in the phrase, "one of thy gates," all come properly under the power of the civil magistrate.

---

* See Digest, pages 338–347.

The Synod of Cincinnati, in October last, after referring to the testimony contained in the Digest, and the recommendations of the General Assembly, on the duties of Masters, &c., resolved, respectfully to ask the next General Assembly to inquire into this matter.

Some brethren have given tokens of alarm at this. But why? Is it wrong for the whole Church, by her Supreme Judicature, on earth, to inquire how her Ministers, Elders, and Communicants perform their relative duties? "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness."

2. This is a part of the judicial law of the Jews, neither ceremonial nor moral, and is binding upon no nation or people any further than they may choose to adopt its principles into their own code.

3. This law had no relation to servants lawfully owned according to the Jewish statutes. For we can never suppose that God would make so many laws respecting servants "born in the house or bought with money of any stranger"—and then introduce a clause that would encourage them all to run away!

4. The language of the statute implies that the masters and servants, spoken of, lived out of the land of Israel, or were a part of the heathen, not expelled. The Pagan master was generally a cruel, inexorable tyrant. He might beat, maim or kill his servant. Servants were often selected as sacrifices to heathen Idols. When any of these miserable wretches fled to God's people for protection, they were by an express statute forbidden to oppress them, and required to grant them citizenship; if, upon a proper examination they were found to be servants escaped from their masters, according to the true meaning of the law. The words "escaped from his master," shew that he was in jeopardy and saved himself by flight, like a bird from the hand of the fowler.*

5. I can recollect but two cases of runaway servants recorded in the Bible, Hagar and Onesimus. One of them the Lord sent back, and Paul sent back the other.†

Servitude has been shown to be a forced state, and classed with war and other evils, which result from the depravity of man; and are permitted, under the Providential Government of God. Some may be ready to ask, "is there no remedy"?

---

* To prove that Hebrew servants were not thus protected, even when they were severely beaten, I here cite Exod. xxi. 20, 21.

"If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money."

† Since the delivery of this Lecture, another case has been pointed out to me, by a friend. The case of Shimei's servants. 1 Kings ii. 39, 40. They went to the king of Gath, but their master went out and brought them back to Jerusalem.

I gladly answer, yes. But the remedy is not in the hands of those "who despise governments"—who "resist the powers that be"—who "consent not to the doctrine that is according to godliness." No, the remedy is to be found in "THE TREE OF LIFE, whose *leaves* are for the *healing* of the nations."

Let all the Ministers of Jesus Christ abandon vain speculations—become scribes well-instructed in the kingdom, and preach Christ and Him crucified, for the salvation of men.—Let all who name the name of Christ, depart from iniquity, and perform the duties of their respective stations and relations in life, with Christian fidelity—and we shall soon see the time, long foretold and much desired—when "officers shall be peace and exactors righteousness"—when war, violence, and oppression shall cease—when "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands shall break in pieces the image of gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay, and fill the whole earth with the knowledge and glory of God." "Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field. And the *work* of righteousness shall be *peace*, and the *effect* of righteousness *quietness* and ASSURANCE FOREVER."